arXiv:1601.06396v4 [cs.IT] 22 Jun 2016

On detecting and quantification of randomness for one-sided sequences

Nikolai Dokuchaev
Department of Mathematics & Statistics, Curtin University,
GPO Box U1987, Perth, 6845 Western Australia

Submitted: January 22, 2016. Revised: June 22, 2016

Abstract

The paper studies discrete time processes and their predictability and randomness in deterministic pathwise setting, without using probabilistic assumptions on the ensemble. We suggest some approaches to quantification of randomness based on frequency analysis of two-sided and one-sided sequences. In addition, the paper suggests an extension of the notion of bandlimitiness on one-sided sequences and a procedure allowing to represent an one-sided sequence as a sum of left-bandlimited and predictable sequences and a non-reducible noise.

Key words: causal approximation, sequences, one-sided sequences, randomness, bandlimitiness, prediction forecasting

1 Introduction

The paper studies discrete time processes and their predictability and randomness in deterministic pathwise setting, without using probabilistic assumptions on the ensemble.

Understanding of the pathwise randomness leads to many applications in Monte-Carlo methods, cryptography, and control systems. There are many classical works devoted to the concept of pathwise randomness and the problem of distinguishability of random sequences; see the references in [20, 14]. In particular, the approach from Borel (1909) [3] , Mises (1919) [22] , Church (1940) [6] was based on limits of the sampling proportions of zeros in the binary sequences and subsequences; Kolmogorov (1965) [18] and Loveland (1966) [21] developed a different concept of the algorithmic randomness and compressibility; Schnorr (1971) [23] suggested approach based on predicability and martingale properties. So far, the exiting theory is devoted to the problem of distinguishability of random sequences and does not consider the problem of quantification of the degree of randomness. This paper studies randomness in the sense of the pathwise predicability and attempts to develop

an approach for quantification and separation of the "noise" for the sequences that are deemed to be random. The estimation of the degree on randomness is a difficult problem, since the task of detecting the randomness is nontrivial itself.

The paper investigates randomness and noise for the sequences in a more special setting originated from the linear filtering and prediction of stochastic processes rather than algorithmic randomness in the sprit of Downey (2004). We suggest exploring the following straightforward pathwise criterion: a class of sequences that is predictable or such that its missing value can be recovered without error from observations of remaining values is assumed to consist of non-random sequences.

For stationary discrete time processes, there is a criterion of predictability and recoverability in the frequency domain setting given by the classical minimality criterion [17], Theorem 24, and the Szegö-Kolmogorov theorem; see [25, 28] and recent literature reviews in [4, 24]. By this theorem, a stationary process is predictable if its spectral density is vanishing with a certain rate at a point of the unit circle $\{z \in \mathbf{C} : \ |z| = 1\}$. In particular, it holds if the spectral density vanishes on an arc of the unit circle, i.e., the process is bandlimited. There are many works devoted to smoothing in frequency domain and sampling; see, e.g., [1, 2, 15, 16, 19, 27, 29] and the bibliography here. In [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13], predictability was readdressed in the deterministic setting for two-sided sequences for with Z-transform vanishing in a point on $\mathbb{T}$, and some predictors were suggested. These results were based on frequency characteristics of the entire two-sided sequences, since the properties of the Z-transforms were used. Application of the two-sided Z-transform requires to select some past time at the middle of the time interval of the observations as the zero point for a model of the two-sided sequence; this could be inconvenient. In many applications, it is more convenient to represent data flow as one-sided sequences such that $x(t)$ represents outdated observations with diminishing significance as $t \to -\infty$. This leads to the analysis of the one-sided sequences directed backward to the past. However, the straightforward application of the one-sided Z-transform to the one-sided sequences does not generate Z-transform vanishing on a part of the unit circle even for a band-limited underlying sequence.

The paper suggests some approaches to quantification of randomness based on frequency analysis of two-sided and one-sided sequences. In addition, the paper suggests an extension of the notion of bandlimitiness on one-sided sequences and a procedure allowing to represent an one-sided sequence as a sum of left-bandlimited and predictable sequences and a non-reducible noise.

2 Definitions and background

We use notation $\operatorname{sinc}(x) = \sin(x)/x$ and $\mathbb{T} = \{z \in \mathbf{C} : \ |z| = 1\}$, and we denote by $\mathbb{Z}$ the set of all integers.

For a Hilbert space H, we denote by $(\cdot,\cdot)_H$ the corresponding inner product. We denote by $L_2(D)$ the usual Hilbert space of complex valued square integrable functions $x : D \to \mathbf{C}$, where D is an interval in $\mathbf{R}$.

Let $\tau \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and $\theta < \tau$; the case where $\theta = -\infty$ is not excluded. We denote by $\ell_r(\theta,\tau)$ the Banach space of complex valued sequences $\{x(t)\}_{t=\theta}^{\tau}$ such that $\|x\|_{\ell_r(\theta,\tau)} = (\sum_{t=\theta}^{\tau} |x(t)|^r)^{1/r} < +\infty$ for $r \in [1,\infty)$ or $\|x\|_{\ell_\infty(\theta,\tau)} = \sup_{t:\theta-1<t<\tau+1} |x(t)| < +\infty$ for $r = +\infty$.

Let $\ell_r = \ell_r(-\infty,+\infty)$ and $\ell_r^- = \ell_r(-\infty,0)$.

For $x \in \ell_1$ or $x \in \ell_2$, we denote by $X = \mathcal{Z}x$ the Z-transform

$$X(z) = \sum_{t=-\infty}^{\infty} x(t) z^{-t}, \quad z \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Respectively, the inverse Z-transform $x = \mathcal{Z}^{-1}X$ is defined as

$$x(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} X\left(e^{i\omega}\right) e^{i\omega t} d\omega, \quad t = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, ...$$

If $x \in \ell_2$, then $X|_{\mathbb{T}}$ is defined as an element of $L_2(\mathbb{T})$.

For a set $I \subset (-\pi,\pi]$, we denote $I^c = (-\pi,\pi] \backslash I$.

Let $\mathcal{J}$ be the set of all $I \subset (-\pi,\pi]$ such that the set $\{e^{i\omega}\}_{\omega\in I}$ is a connected arc and $I^c \neq \emptyset$.

For any $I \in \mathcal{J}$, we denote by ω_I the middle point $e^{i\omega_I}$ of the arc $\{e^{i\omega}\}_{\omega\in I}$.

We denote by $\mathbf{X}_{BL}(I)$ the set of all mappings $X : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbf{C}$ such that $X\left(e^{i\omega}\right) \in L_2(-\pi,\pi)$ and $X\left(e^{i\omega}\right) = 0$ for $\omega \notin I$. We will call the corresponding processes $x = \mathcal{Z}^{-1}X$ *band-limited*. Let $\ell_2^{BL}(I) = \{x \in \ell_2 :\ X = \mathcal{Z}x \in \mathbf{X}_{BL}(I)\}$.

Definition 1. *Assume that there exists $I \in \mathcal{J}$ such that $x \in \ell_2^-$ represents the trace of a band-limited process $x_{BL} \in \ell_2^{BL}(I)$ with the spectrum on I, i.e., $x(t) = x_{BL}(t)$ for $t \leq 0$, and $X_{BL} = \mathcal{Z}x_{BL} \in \mathbf{X}_{BL}(I)$. We call the process x left band-limited with the spectrum on I.*

Let $\ell_2^{-,LBL}(I)$ be the subset of ℓ_2^- consisting of semi-infinite sequences $\{x(t)\}_{t\leq 0}$ such that $x(t) = (\mathcal{Z}^{-1}X)(t)$ for $t \leq 0$ for some $X \in \mathbf{X}_{BL}(I)$.

3 Quantification of randomness for two-sided sequences

Let us discuss first a straightforward approach where noise is associated with the high-frequency component. Consider a sequence $x \in \ell_2$ that does not feature predicability described in Lemma 1. Let

$$X = \mathcal{Z}X, \qquad Y_{BL}|_{\mathbb{T}} = (\mathbb{I}_I X)|_{\mathbb{T}}, \qquad y_{BL} = \mathcal{Z}^{-1}Y_{BL}$$

for some given $I \in \mathcal{J}$. Here $\mathbb{I}$ is the indicator function, i.e., $\mathbb{I}_I\left(e^{i\omega}\right) = 1$ if $\omega \in I$ and $\mathbb{I}_I\left(e^{i\omega}\right) = 0$ if $\omega \in I^c = (-\pi, \pi] \backslash I$. In many applications, it is acceptable to deem the process $n_{BL}(t) = x(t) - y_{BL}(t)$ with $I = I_0 = (-\Omega, \Omega)$, where $\Omega \in (0, \pi)$, to be a noise accompanying the systematic movement $y_{BL}(t)$. However, estimation of $n_{BL}(t)$ will not help to quantify the randomness of x, since

$$\|n_{BL}\|_{\ell_2} = \|x - y_{BL}\|_{\ell_2} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \text{mes}\,(-\pi, \pi] \setminus I) \to 0 \quad \text{for any} \quad x \in \ell_2. \tag{3.1}$$

In addition, n_{BL} is also a predictable band-limited process,

$$n_{BL} = x - y_{BL} = \mathcal{Z}^{-1}(\mathbb{I}_{I^c}\mathcal{Z}x) \in \ell_2^{BL}(I^c),$$

In particular, this means that any two-sided sequence $x \in \ell_2$ can be represented as as a sum

$$x = y_{BL} + n_{BL}, \quad y_{BL} \in \ell_2^{BL}(I), \quad n_{BL} \in \ell_2^{BL}(I^c), \tag{3.2}$$

i.e., as a sum of two two-sided band-limited predictable in the sense of Lemma 1 sequences, and that can be done with any choice of I. This also does not lead to possibility to detect and quantify randomness.

We suggest a different approach. We will show below a meaningful quantification of the randomness of $x \in \ell_2$ can be achieved with the value

$$\sigma(x) = \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\omega \in (-\pi, \pi]} |X\left(e^{i\omega}\right)|, \quad X = \mathcal{Z}x. \tag{3.3}$$

3.1 Randomness as a measure of non-predictability

Some predictability results for two-sided sequences

Two-sided band-limited sequences are predictable in the following sense.

Theorem 1. *(i) Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \ell_2^{BL}(I)$ be a bounded set. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a mapping $\widehat{k}(\cdot) : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbf{R}$ such that $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \|x(t) - \widehat{x}(t)\| \le \varepsilon$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ for $\widehat{x}(t) \triangleq e^{i\omega_I t} \sum_{s \le t-1} \widehat{k}(t - s) e^{-i\omega_I s} x(s)$.*

(ii) Let $\mathcal{J}_1 \subset \mathcal{J}$ be a set of I such that $\sup_{I \in J_1} \text{mes}\,(I) < 2\pi$. Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \cup_{I \in \mathcal{J}_1} \ell_2^{BL}(I)$ be a bounded set in ℓ_2. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a mapping $\widehat{k}(\cdot) : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbf{R}$ such that $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \|x(t) - \widehat{x}(t)\| \le \varepsilon$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ for $\widehat{x}(t) \triangleq e^{i\omega_I t} \sum_{s \le t-1} \widehat{k}(t - s) e^{-i\omega_I s} x(s)$.

(iii) Let $\mathcal{J}_1$ be the set of $I \in \mathcal{J}$ such that $\sup_{I \in J} \text{mes}\,(I) < 2\pi$, and $\mathcal{X} \subset \cup_{I \in \mathcal{J}_1} \ell_2^{BL}(I)$ be a bounded set in ℓ_2 such that $\sum_{t \le \tau} |x(t)|^2 \to 0$ as $\tau \to +\infty$ uniformly over $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\tau < 0$ and a mapping $\widehat{k}(\cdot) : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbf{R}$ such that $\sup_{t \ge 1} \|x(t) - \widehat{x}(t)\| \le \varepsilon$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ for $\widehat{x}(t) \triangleq e^{i\omega_I t} \sum_{s=\tau}^{t-1} \widehat{k}(t - s) e^{-i\omega_I s} x(s)$.

Theorem 1(iii) states that some predicability based on finite sets of observations also can be achieved if we relax predicability requirement to cover times $t \geq 1$ only; this would be a weaker version of predicability comparing with the one described in Theorem 1 (ii).

Some versions of this Theorem and some examples of predictable classes can be found in [9, 10].

In addition, it appears that the spectrum supporting sets I can be estimated from the set of observations $\{x(s)\}_{s\leq\tau}$ for any $\tau < 0$. More precisely, the following theorem holds.

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \ell_2$ be a set such that if $x \in \mathcal{X}$ then $x \in \ell_2^{BL}(I)$ for some $I = I(x) \in \mathcal{J}$, and that $\nu \triangleq 2\pi - \sup_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \mathrm{mes}\,(I(x)) > 0$. Let $\widehat{\nu} = \nu/3$. Then, for any $\tau < 0$, there exists a mapping $F : \ell_2(-\infty, \tau) \to (-\pi, \pi]$ such that, for $\widehat{\omega}_c = F(x(t)|_{t\leq\tau})$, $\mathbb{T}_c \subset \{e^{i\omega},\ \omega \in I^c\}$, where*

$$\mathbb{T}_c = \left\{ e^{i(\omega+\pi)} :\ \omega \in (-\pi, \pi],\ \min_{k=0,\pm1} |\widehat{\omega}_c - \omega + 2k\pi| \leq \widehat{\nu} \right\}.$$

In other words, if $x \in \mathcal{X}$, then $x \in \ell_2^{BL}(\widehat{I})$ and $I \subset \widehat{I}$, where

$$\widehat{I} = \left\{ \omega \in (-\pi, \pi] : e^{i\omega} \notin \mathbb{T}_c \right\}.$$

The set $\widehat{I}$ in Theorem 2 can be regarded as an estimate of I based on observations of $\{x(t)\}_{t\leq\tau}$.

Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \ell_2 \cap \ell_1$ be a class of processes such that $\sigma(x) > 0$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and that, for $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $X = Zx$, for any $m > 0$, the functions $X\left(e^{i\omega}\right)$ and $|X\left(e^{i\omega}\right)|^{-1}$ are differentiable in $\omega \in \mathbf{R}$ and that $\sup_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \sup_{\omega\in[-\pi,\pi]} |dX\left(e^{i\omega}\right)/d\omega| < +\infty$. For the purpose of the investigation of the predictability for x, this smoothness and assumed without a loss generality: it is sufficient to replace x by a faster vanishing processes with the same predictability properties such that $x(t)/(1+|t|^m)$, $m \geq 2$. $\sigma = \min_{\omega\in[-\pi,\pi]} |X\left(e^{i\omega}\right)| > 0$

We want to represent each $x \in \mathcal{X}$ as

$$x = y_{BL} + n,$$

where y_{BL} is a band-limited predictable process such that the class $\mathcal{Y} = \{y_{BL}\}_{x\in\mathcal{X}}$, is predictable in the sense of Lemma 1. In this case, each $n = x - y_{BL}$ is a non-predictable (random) noise.

We suggest the following restrictions on the choice of y_{BL}:

(i)

$$\|X\left(e^{i\omega}\right)\|_{L_d(-\pi,\pi)} = \|Y_{BL}\left(e^{i\omega}\right)\|_{L_d(-\pi,\pi)} + \|N\left(e^{i\omega}\right)\|_{L_d(-\pi,\pi)}, \quad d = 1, +\infty, \tag{3.4}$$

where $Y_{BL} = \mathcal{Z}y_{BL}$ and $N = \mathcal{Z}n'$.

(ii) n does not allow a similar representation $n = y'_{BL} + n'$, with a non-random (predictable) non-zero y'_{BL} such that

$$\|N\left(e^{i\omega}\right)\|_{L_d(-\pi,\pi)} = \|Y'\left(e^{i\omega}\right)\|_{L_d(-\pi,\pi)} + \|N'\left(e^{i\omega}\right)\|_{L_d(-\pi,\pi)}, \quad d = 1, +\infty,$$

where $Y'_{BL} = \mathcal{Z}y'_{BL}$ and $N' = \mathcal{Z}n'$.

It appears that n featuring these properties exists in some case and can be derived explicitly from X. Let us show this.

Let $\omega_0 \in (-\pi, \pi]$ be such that $|X\left(e^{i\omega_I}\right)| = \sigma$, and let

$$\gamma\left(e^{i\omega}\right) = \frac{\sigma(x)}{|X\left(e^{i\omega}\right)|}, \quad Y\left(e^{i\omega}\right) = [1 - \gamma\left(e^{i\omega}\right)]X\left(e^{i\omega}\right), \quad N\left(e^{i\omega}\right) = \gamma\left(e^{i\omega}\right) X\left(e^{i\omega}\right). \tag{3.5}$$

Clearly,

$$X = Y + N, \quad Y\left(e^{i\omega_I}\right) = 0, \quad |N\left(e^{i\omega}\right)| \equiv \sigma(x),$$

and (3.4) holds with $d = 1$ and $d = \infty$. By continuity of $X\left(e^{i\omega}\right)$ and $|X\left(e^{i\omega}\right)|^{-1}$, the function $Y\left(e^{i\omega}\right)$ is also continuous ω.

If $Y\left(e^{i\omega}\right)$ vanishes fast enough when $\omega \to \omega_0$ (see [9]), then $y = \mathcal{Z}^{-1}Y$ is predictable; in this case, the set $\{n\}_{x\in\mathcal{X}}$ can be considered as the set of pathwise noises; therefore, this gives a quantification n as a norm of n or N, such as

$$\|N\left(e^{i\omega}\right)\|_{L_1(-\pi,\pi)} = \sigma(x). \tag{3.6}$$

However, it would be too restrictive to require that the set $\mathcal{X}$ is such that (3.5) leads to $Y\left(e^{i\omega}\right)$ that vanishes so fast as $\omega \to \omega_0$ that y_{BL} is predictable. To overcome this, we suggest to replace (3.5) by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\gamma_\varepsilon\left(e^{i\omega}\right) = 1 \quad \text{if} \quad |e^{i\omega} - e^{i\omega_0}| \le \varepsilon, \\
&\gamma_\varepsilon\left(e^{i\omega}\right) = \frac{\sigma(x)}{|X\left(e^{i\omega}\right)|} \quad \text{if} \quad |e^{i\omega} - e^{i\omega_0}| > \varepsilon, \\
&Y_\varepsilon\left(e^{i\omega}\right) = [1 - \gamma\left(e^{i\omega}\right)]X\left(e^{i\omega}\right), \qquad N_\varepsilon\left(e^{i\omega}\right) = \gamma_\varepsilon\left(e^{i\omega}\right) X\left(e^{i\omega}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

where $\varepsilon \to 0$. In this case,

$$x = y_\varepsilon + n_\varepsilon, \quad y_\varepsilon = \mathcal{Z}^{-1}Y_\varepsilon \in \ell_2^{BL}(I_\varepsilon), \quad n_\varepsilon = \mathcal{Z}^{-1}N_\varepsilon, \tag{3.8}$$

where $I_\varepsilon = \{\omega : \ |e^{i\omega} - e^{i\omega_0}| \le \varepsilon\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|N_\varepsilon\left(e^{i\omega}\right)| = X\left(e^{i\omega}\right), \quad \text{if} \quad \omega \in I_\varepsilon, \\
&|N_\varepsilon\left(e^{i\omega}\right)| = |X\left(e^{i\omega_0}\right)| = \text{const} \quad \text{if} \quad \omega \notin I_\varepsilon,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

We regard n_ε as approximation of the noise as $\varepsilon \to 0+$.

To justify this description of the noise, we have to show that the set of band-limited processes $\{y_\varepsilon\}$ in (3.7)-(3.8) is predictable in some sense. Theorem 1(i)-(ii) does not ensure predicability of this set, since it requires to know the values ω_0. This would require to know ω_{I_ε}, which is

inconsistent with the notion of predictability. However, Theorem 2 ensures sufficient estimation of I_ε and ω_{I_ε} based on observations of $\{x(t)\}_{t\le\tau}$; we can take select $\omega_{I_\varepsilon}=\widehat{\omega}_c-\pi$ if $\widehat{\omega}_c\in(0,\pi]$, and $\omega_{I_\varepsilon}=\widehat{\omega}_c+\pi$ if $\widehat{\omega}_c\in(-\pi,0]$, in the notations of Theorem 2. This leads to the following two step procedure: the set $\{x(s)\}_{\tau<s<t}$ is used for prediction of $x(t)$, and the set $\{x(s)\}_{s\le\tau}$ is used for the estimation of $\widehat{\omega}_{I_\varepsilon}\approx\omega_{I_\varepsilon}$. This allows to satisfy conditions of Theorem 1(iii).

Therefore, the set of band-limited processes $\{y_\varepsilon\}$ in (3.7)-(3.8) is predictable in the sense of Theorem 1(iii). This predictability covers times $t\ge 1$ only; it is a weaker version of predictability comparing with the one described in Lemma 1(i)-(ii).

Since a norm for N_ε is approaching the norm for N, the norm of N can be used for quantification of the randomness of the two-sided sequences.

The process $y_\varepsilon=\mathcal{Z}^{-1}Y_\varepsilon$ can also be interpreted as an output of a smoothing filter.

This support the choice of the value $\sigma(x)$ for the quantification of x.

3.2 Randomness as a measure of recoverability

By recoverability, we mean a possibility of constructing a linear recovering operator as described in the definition below.

Note that $X\left(e^{i\omega}\right)$ is continuous in ω for $x\in\ell_1$, $X=\mathcal{Z}x$.

Let $\omega_0\in(0,\pi]$ be given. For $\sigma\ge 0$, let $\mathcal{X}_\sigma=\{x\in\ell_1:\ \min_{\omega\in(-\pi,\pi]}|X\left(e^{i\omega}\right)|=|X\left(e^{i\omega_0}\right)|=\sigma\}$.

For $m\in\mathbb{Z}$, assume that the value $x(m)$ is not observable for $x\in\ell_1$ and that all other values of x are observable. We consider recovering problem for $x(m)$ as finding an estimate $\widetilde{x}(m)=F\left(x|_{t\in\mathbb{Z}\setminus\{m\}}\right)$, where $F:\ell_1(-\infty,m-1)\times\ell_1(m+1,+\infty)\to\mathbf{R}$ is some mapping.

Theorem 3. *For any estimator $\widetilde{x}(m)=F\left(x|_{t\in\mathbb{Z}\setminus\{m\}}\right)$, where $F:\ell_1(-\infty,m-1)\times\ell_1(m+1,+\infty)\to\mathbf{R}$ is some mapping, we have that*

$$\sup_{x\in\mathcal{X}_\sigma}|\widetilde{x}(m)-x(m)|\ge\sigma. \tag{3.10}$$

In addition, there exists an optimal estimator $\widehat{x}(m)=\widehat{F}\left(x|_{t\in\mathbb{Z}\setminus\{m\}}\right)$, where $\widehat{F}:\ell_1(-\infty,m-1)\times\ell_1(m+1,+\infty)\to\mathbf{R}$ is some mapping, such that

$$\sup_{x\in\mathcal{X}_\sigma}|\widehat{x}(m)-x(m)|=\sigma. \tag{3.11}$$

This supports again the choice of the value $\sigma(x)$ for the quantification of the randomness for x.

4 Separating the noise for one-sided sequences

Unfortunately, representation (3.2) does not lead toward a solution of the predictability problem, since it would require to know the entire sequence $\{x(t)\}_{t=-\infty}^{+\infty}$ to calculate $X=\mathcal{Z}x$.

On the other hand, it is natural to use one-sided sequences interpreted as available past observations for predictability problems. For this, we have to use the notion of left bandlimitness for one-sided sequences. We will use a modification of representation (3.2) that was stated for two-sided sequences.

For this, we have to of representation to two-sided sequences. We suggest to replace the "ideal" projections $\widehat{x}_{BL} = \mathcal{Z}^{-1}(\mathbb{I}_I \mathcal{Z} x) \in \ell_2$ for $x \in \ell_2$ and $y_{BL} = x - \widehat{x}_{BL} = \mathcal{Z}^{-1}(\mathbb{I}_{I^c} \mathcal{Z} x)$ by their "optimal" one-sided substitutes.

Uniqueness of the extrapolation for left band-limited processes

Lemma 1. *For any $I \in \mathcal{J}$ and any $x \in \ell_2^{-,LBL}(I)$, there exists an unique $x_{BL} \in \ell_2^{BL}(I)$ such that $x(t) = x_{BL}(t)$ for $t \leq 0$.*

By Lemma 1, the future values $x_{BL}(t)|_{t>0}$ of a band-limited process x_{BL}, are uniquely defined by the trace $x_{BL}(t)|_{t\leq 0}$. This statement represent a reformulation in the deterministic setting of the classical Szegö-Kolmogorov Theorem for stationary Gaussian processes [18, 25, 26, 28].

Existence of optimal band-limited approximation

Let $x \in \ell_2^-$ be a semi-infinite one-sided sequence representing available historical data, and let $I \in \mathcal{J}$.

Theorem 4. *There exists an unique optimal solution $\widehat{x}$ of the minimization problem*

$$\textit{Minimize} \quad \sum_{t=-\infty}^{0} |\widehat{x}(t) - x(t)|^2 \quad \textit{over} \quad \widehat{x} \in \ell_2^{-,LBL}(I). \tag{4.1}$$

By Lemma 1, there exists a unique band-limited process $x_{BL} \in \ell_2^{BL}(I)$ such that $\widehat{x}(t)|_{t\leq 0} = x_{BL}(t)|_{t\leq 0}$. This offers a natural way to extrapolate a left band-limited solution $\widehat{x} \in \ell_2^-$ of problem (4.1) on the future times $t > 0$.

The optimal solution

Let $I \in \mathcal{J}$ be given, and let $\text{mes}\,(I) = 2\Omega$ for some $\Omega \in (0, \pi)$.

Let $I_0 = (-\Omega, \Omega)$, i.e., $\omega_{I_0} = 0$.

For $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi)$, let the operator $p_\omega : \ell_2^- \to \ell_2^-$ be defined as $\bar{x}(t) = e^{i\omega t} x(t)$ for $\bar{x} = p_\omega x$.

Let the operator $\mathcal{Q} : \ell_2 \to \ell_2^{-,LBL}(I_0)$ be defined as $\widehat{x} = \mathcal{Q} y = \mathcal{Z}^{-1} \widehat{X}$, where

$$\widehat{X}\left(e^{i\omega}\right) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} y_k e^{ik\omega\pi/\Omega} \mathbb{I}_{\{|\omega|\leq\Omega\}}, \tag{4.2}$$

for the corresponding $y = \{y_k\} \in \ell_2$. Similarly to the classical sinc representation, we obtain that

$$\widehat{x}(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\Omega}^{\Omega}\left(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} y_k e^{ik\omega\pi/\Omega}\right)e^{i\omega t}d\omega = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} y_k \int_{-\Omega}^{\Omega} e^{ik\omega\pi/\Omega+i\omega t}d\omega$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} y_k \frac{e^{ik\pi+i\Omega t} - e^{-ik\pi-i\Omega t}}{ik\pi/\Omega + it} = \frac{\Omega}{\pi}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_N} y_k \mathrm{sinc}\,(k\pi + \Omega t) = (\mathcal{Q}y)(t). \tag{4.3}$$

It follows that the $\mathcal{Q} : \ell_2 \to \ell_2^{-,LBL}(I_0)$ is actually defined as

$$\widehat{x}(t) = (\mathcal{Q}y)(t) = \frac{\Omega}{\pi}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} y_k \mathrm{sinc}\,(k\pi + \Omega t).$$

Consider the operator $\mathcal{Q}^* : \ell_2^{-,LBL}(I_0) \to \ell_2$ being adjoint to the operator $\mathcal{Q} : \ell_2 \to \ell_2^{-,LBL}(I_0)$, i.e., such that

$$(\mathcal{Q}^* x)_k = \frac{\Omega}{\pi}\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}} \mathrm{sinc}\,(k\pi + \Omega t)x(t). \tag{4.4}$$

Consider a linear bounded non-negatively defined Hermitian operator $R : \ell_2 \to \ell_2$ defined as

$$R = \mathcal{Q}^*\mathcal{Q}.$$

Consider operator $P_I = p_{\omega_I}\mathcal{Q}R^{-1}\mathcal{Q}^* p_{-\omega_I} : \ell_2 \to \ell_2^{-,LBL}(I)$.

Theorem 5. *(i) The operator $R : \ell_2 \to \ell_2$ has a bounded inverse operator $R^{-1} : \ell_2 \to \ell_2$.*

(ii) Problem (4.1) has a unique solution

$$\widehat{x} = P_I x. \tag{4.5}$$

Theorem 6. *For any $I \in \mathcal{J}$, there exists $n_I \in \ell_2^-$ such that $P_I n_I = 0$ and $n_I \neq 0$.*

The processes n_I can be considered as the noise component with respect to smooth processes with the spectrum on I, for a given $I \in \mathcal{J}$.

Corollary 1. *A process $x \in \ell_2^-$ is left-bandlimited with the spectrum I if and only if $x = p_{\omega_I}\mathcal{Q}R^{-1}\mathcal{Q}^* p_{-\omega_I} x$.*

Remark 1. *It can be noted that $\widehat{x} = p_{\omega_I}\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{Q}^+ p_{-\omega_I} x$, where $\mathcal{Q}^+ = R^{-1}\mathcal{Q}^* : \ell_2^- \to \ell_2$ is a Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse of the operator $\mathcal{Q} : \ell_2 \to \ell_2^-$.*

Let us elaborate equation (4.5). The optimal process $\widehat{x}$ can be expressed as

$$\widehat{x}(t) = e^{i\omega_I t}\frac{\Omega}{\pi}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \widehat{y}_k \mathrm{sinc}\,(k\pi + \Omega t).$$

Here $\widehat{y} = \{\widehat{y}_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is defined as

$$\widehat{y} = R^{-1}\mathcal{Q}p_{-\omega_I}x. \tag{4.6}$$

The operator R can be represented via a matrix $R = \{R_{km}\}$, where $k, m \in \mathbb{Z}$. In this setting, $(Ry)_k = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} R_{km}y_m$, and the components of the matrix R are defined as

$$R_{km} = \frac{\Omega^2}{\pi^2}\sum_{j=-\infty}^{0} \operatorname{sinc}(m\pi + \Omega j)\operatorname{sinc}(k\pi + \Omega j).$$

Respectively, the components of the vector $\mathcal{Q}^*x = \{(\mathcal{Q}^*x)_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ are defined as

$$(\mathcal{Q}^*x)_k = \frac{\Omega}{\pi}\sum_{j=-\infty}^{0} \operatorname{sinc}(k\pi + \Omega j)x(j). \tag{4.7}$$

4.1 A multi-step procedure for one-sided sequences

Unfortunately, the approach described in Section 3 does not lead toward a solution of the predictability problem, since it would require to know the entire sequence $\{x(t)\}_{t=-\infty}^{+\infty}$ to calculate $X = \mathcal{Z}x$ and quantitative characteristics suggested in Section 3.

On the other hand, it is natural to use one-sided sequences interpreted as available past observations for predictability problems. In this case, we have to use the notion of left bandlimitness for one-sided sequences. We will use a modification of representation (3.2) that was stated for two-sided sequences.

For this, we suggest to replace the "ideal" projections $\widehat{x}_{BL} = \mathcal{Z}^{-1}(\mathbb{I}_I\mathcal{Z}x) \in \ell_2$ for $x \in \ell_2$ by their "optimal" one-sided substitutes $\widehat{x} = P_I x \in \ell_2^-$; this substitution is optimal on $\{t \le 0\}$ in the sense of optimization problem (4.1). Unfortunately, it may happen that

$$x - \widehat{x} \notin \ell_2^{-,LBL}(I^c).$$

For this, we suggest to replace the "ideal" projections $\widehat{x}_{BL} = \mathcal{Z}^{-1}(\mathbb{I}_I\mathcal{Z}x) \in \ell_2$ for $x \in \ell_2$ and $y_{BL} = x - \widehat{x}_{BL} = \mathcal{Z}^{-1}(\mathbb{I}_{I^c}\mathcal{Z}x)$ by their "optimal" one-sided substitutes $\widehat{x} = P_I x \in \ell_2^-$ and $\widehat{y} = P_{I^c}(x - \widehat{x}) \in \ell_2^-$; this substitution is optimal on $\{t \le 0\}$ in the sense of optimization problem (4.1). Unfortunately, it may happen that

$$\widehat{y} = P_{I^c}(x - \widehat{x}) \notin \ell_2^{-,LBL}(I^c).$$

We suggest a multi-step procedure that to deal with this complication.

Assume that we observe a semi-infinite one-sided sequence $\{x(t)\}_{t\le 0} \in \ell_2^-$.

Consider a sequence of sets $\{I_k\}_{k=0,1,2,..} \subset \mathcal{J}$, with the corresponding middle points $\omega_k \in I_k$. Further, let us consider the following sequences of elements of ℓ_2^-:

- Set

$$x_0 = x, \qquad \widehat{x}_0 = P_{I_0} x_0, \qquad y_0 = x_0 - \widehat{x}_0, \qquad \widehat{y}_0 = P_{I_0^c} y_0, \quad x_1 = y_0 - \widehat{y}_0.$$

- For $k \geq 1$, set

$$\widehat{x}_k = P_{I_k} x_k, \qquad y_k = x_k - \widehat{x}_k, \qquad \widehat{y}_k = P_{I_k^c} y_k, \quad x_{k+1} = y_k - \widehat{y}_k.$$

The following lemma will be useful.

Lemma 2. *For any $I \in \mathcal{J}$ and $x \in \ell_2^-$, the following holds:*

(i) $\|x\| \geq \|x - P_I x\|$, and

(ii) The equality in (i) holds if and only if $P_I x = 0$.

Stopping upon arriving at a predictable process

If there exists $k \geq 0$ such that $y_k = 0$ then

$$x = \widehat{x}_0 + y_0 = \widehat{x}_0 + \widehat{y}_0 + x_1 = \widehat{x}_0 + \widehat{y}_0 + \widehat{x}_1 + y_1 = ... = \widehat{x}_0 + \widehat{y}_0 + \widehat{x}_1 + \widehat{y}_1 + ... + \widehat{x}_k. \tag{4.8}$$

This means that x is a finite sum of left band-limited processes. These processes were calculated by the observer, and, in this sense, each of them can be deemed to be observed, with known (pres-selected) I_k; in particular, x can be predicted without error. Similarly, if there exists $k \geq 0$ that $x_{k+1} = 0$, then

$$x = \widehat{x}_0 + y_0 = \widehat{x}_0 + \widehat{y}_0 + x_1 = \widehat{x}_0 + \widehat{y}_0 + \widehat{x}_1 + y_1 = ... = \widehat{x}_0 + \widehat{y}_0 + \widehat{x}_1 + \widehat{y}_1 + ... + \widehat{y}_k. \tag{4.9}$$

This means that x again is a finite sum of observed left band-limited processes. Again, x can be predicted without error.

The norms $\|\eta_k\|_{\ell_2^-}$ and $\|\bar{\eta}_k\|_{\ell_2^-}$ can be used for quantification of the randomness of one-sided semi-infinite sequences.

The case of never stopping procedure

It may happen that, for any $N > 0$, there exists $k \geq N$ such that either $\|y_k\|_{\ell_2^-} + \|x_k\|_{\ell_2^-} > 0$. In this, the randomness can be quantified as

$$\max\left(\limsup_{k\to+\infty} \|x_k\|_{\ell_2^-}, \limsup_{k\to+\infty} \|y_k\|_{\ell_2^-}\right).$$

Arrival at a non-reducible noise

A process $x \in \ell_2^-$ is either left band-limited or not band-limited. Therefore, some processes cannot be represented as a finite sum of left bandlimited processes such as (4.8) or (4.9) with a finite k. In this case, the procedure will not be stopped according to the rule described above. It could be beneficial to stop procedure using the following rule.

Let

$$\delta_k \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \|x_k\|_{\ell_2^-} - \|x_k - \widehat{x}_k\|_{\ell_2^-}, \qquad \bar{\delta}_k \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \|y_k\|_{\ell_2^-} - \|y_k - \widehat{y}_k\|_{\ell_2^-},$$

i.e., $\delta_k = \|x_k\|_{\ell_2^-} - \|y_k\|_{\ell_2^-}$, $\bar{\delta}_k = \|y_k\|_{\ell_2^-} - \|x_{k+1}\|_{\ell_2^-}$,

$$\|x_k\|_{\ell_2^-} = \|y_k\|_{\ell_2^-} + \delta_k = \|x_{k+1}\|_{\ell_2^-} + \delta_k + \bar{\delta}_k, \quad k = 0, 1, ...$$

$$\|y_k\|_{\ell_2^-} = \|x_{k+1}\|_{\ell_2^-} + \bar{\delta}_k = \|y_{k+1}\|_{\ell_2^-} + \delta_k + \bar{\delta}_k, \quad k = 0, 1, ...$$

By Lemma 2, it follows that $\delta_k \geq 0$ and $\bar{\delta}_k \geq 0$ for all k, i.e.,

$$\|x_k\|_{\ell_2^-} \geq \|y_k\|_{\ell_2^-} \geq \|x_{k+1}\|_{\ell_2^-}, \quad k = 0, 1, ...$$

By Theorem 6, it may happen that $\delta_k = 0$, i.e., $\|x_k\|_{\ell_2^-} = \|y_k\|_{\ell_2^-}$. To save the resources, the procedure should be stopped when this occurs, since further steps will not improve the result. On this step, x is presented as

$$x = \widehat{x}_0 + \widehat{y}_0 + \widehat{x}_1 + \widehat{y}_1 + ... + \widehat{x}_k + y_k = x_p^{(k)} + \eta_k.$$

where $x_p^{(k)} = \widehat{x}_0 + \widehat{y}_0 + \widehat{x}_1 + \widehat{y}_1 + ... + \widehat{x}_k$ is a predictable process since it is a finite sum of observed left band-limited processes, and $\eta_k = y_k$ is a noise. Given the selected set $\{I_k\}$, further reduction of the norm of this noise is impossible. Hence we can call y_k a non-reducible noise.

Similarly, it may happen that $\bar{\delta}_k = 0$ and $\delta_k > 0$, i.e. $\|y_k\|_{\ell_2^-} = \|x_{k+1}\|_{\ell_2^-}$. Again, the procedure should be stopped when this occurs, since further steps will not improve the result. This means that the procedure have to stop on the step where x is presented as

$$x = \widehat{x}_0 + \widehat{y}_0 + \widehat{x}_1 + \widehat{y}_1 + ... + \widehat{y}_k + x_{k+1} = y_{BL}^{(k)} + \bar{\eta}_k.$$

Here $y_p^{(k)} = \widehat{x}_0 + \widehat{y}_0 + \widehat{x}_1 + \widehat{y}_1 + ... + \widehat{y}_k$ is a predictable process again, and $\bar{\eta}_k = x_{k+1}$ is a non-reducible noise again.

5 Proofs

For the case where $I_0 = (-\Omega, \Omega)$, i.e. $\omega_I = 0$, the proofs of Theorem 1, Lemma 1 and Theorems 4-5, can be found in [9]. Let us extend these proofs on case where $\omega_I \neq 0$.

Let us observe that $x \in \ell_2^{-,LBL}(I)$ and $X = \mathcal{Z}x \in \mathbf{X}_{BL}(I)$ if and only if $x_0 \stackrel{\Delta}{=} p_{-\omega_I} x \in \ell_2^{-,LBL}(I_0)$ and $X_0 \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \mathcal{Z}x_0 \in \mathcal{X}(I_0)$. In this case, $x = p_{\omega_I} x_0$, and

$$X\left(e^{i\omega}\right) = \sum_{t=-\infty}^{\infty} x(t) e^{-i\omega t} = \sum_{t=-\infty}^{\infty} x_0(t) e^{i\omega_I t} e^{-i\omega t} = X_0\left(e^{i(\omega_I - \omega)t}\right), \quad \omega \in [0, 2\pi).$$

Then the proof of Theorem 1(i)-(ii) and Lemma 1 follows.

Proof of Theorem 1 (iii) follows from the robustness of the predictor used in [9] with respect to truncation of inputs from ℓ_2. □

Further, we have that

$$\|\widehat{x} - x\|_{\ell_2^-} = \|p_{-\omega_I}\widehat{x} - p_{-\omega_I} x\|_{\ell_2^-} \quad \text{for any} \quad \widehat{x}, x \in \ell_2^-.$$

Hence the problem

$$\text{Minimize} \quad \|p_{-\omega_I}\widehat{x} - p_{-\omega_I} x\|_{\ell_2^-} \quad \text{over} \quad \widehat{x} \in \ell_2^{-,LBL}(I) \tag{5.1}$$

has the same sets of solution as problem (4.1). Therefore, there is a bijection between the sets of optimal solutions for problem (4.1) and for the problem

$$\text{Minimize} \quad \|\widehat{y} - y\|_{\ell_2^-} \quad \text{over} \quad \widehat{y} \in \ell_2^{-,LBL}(I_0), \tag{5.2}$$

where $y = p_{-\omega_I} x$. This bijection has the form $\widehat{y} = p_{-\omega_I}\widehat{x}$. Therefore, the proof for $\omega_I \neq 0$ follows from the proof for $\omega_I = 0$ from [9]. Then the proof of Theorem 4 and Theorem 5 follows. □

Proof of Theorem 2. It is easy to see that there exists a finite set $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^M \subset \mathcal{J}$, $M < +\infty$, such that $\text{mes}\,(I_k) \leq \nu/3$, $\cup_{k=1}^M I_k = (0, 2\pi]$, and that the intersections of two different I_k cannot contain two or more elements. Let $\widehat{I}_k = (-\pi, \pi] \setminus I_k$.

Let P_I be operators such as defined in Section 4, with rather technical adjustment: we assume that the set of times $\{t \leq 0\}$ in Theorem 4 is replaced by the $\{t \leq \tau\}$, and that ℓ_2^- replaced by $\ell_2(-\infty, \tau)$. As is shown in Theorem 5, the values $d_k \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \|\mathbf{P}_{\widehat{I}_k} x - x\|_{\ell_2(-\infty,\tau)}$ for $k = 1, ..., M$ can be found based on observations of $\{x(t)\}_{t \leq \tau}$. By the assumptions on x, there exists m such that $d_m = 0$. The set $\widehat{I} = \widehat{I}_m$ is such as described in the Theorem; the point $\widehat{\omega}_c$ can be defined as select $\widehat{\omega}_c = \widehat{\omega}_{\widehat{I}} - \pi$ if $\widehat{\omega}_{\widehat{I}} \in (0, \pi]$, and $\widehat{\omega}_c = \widehat{\omega}_{\widehat{I}} + \pi$ if $\widehat{\omega}_{\widehat{I}} \in (-\pi, 0]$. Then the proof of Theorem 2 follows. □ □

Proof of Theorem 3. Let $Y\left(e^{i\omega}\right) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{m\}} e^{-i\omega k} x(k)$, $\omega \in (-\pi, \pi]$; this function to be observable. By the definitions, it follows that

$$X\left(e^{i\omega}\right) - Y\left(e^{i\omega}\right) - e^{-im} x(m) \equiv 0, \quad \omega \in (-\pi, \pi].$$

Hence

$$x(m) = -e^{im}Y\left(e^{\omega_0}\right) + e^{im}X\left(e^{\omega_0}\right) = -e^{im}Y\left(e^{\omega_0}\right) + \xi,$$

where $\xi = e^{im}X\left(e^{\omega_0}\right)$. Hence

$$|x(m) + e^{im}Y\left(e^{\omega_0}\right)| = |\xi| = \sigma.$$

Let us accept the value $\widehat{x}(m) = -e^{im}Y\left(e^{\omega_0}\right)$ as the estimate of the missing value $x(m)$. For this estimator, the size of the recovery error is σ for any $x \in \mathcal{X}_\sigma$. If $\sigma = 0$ then the estimator is error-free. In a general case where $\sigma \geq 0$, we have that (3.11) holds.

Let us show that this estimator is optimal in the following sense:

$$\sigma = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}_\sigma} |\widehat{x}(m) - x(m)| \leq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}_\sigma} |\widetilde{x}(m) - x(m)|$$

for any other estimator $\widetilde{x}(m) = F\left(x|_{t \in \mathbb{Z}\setminus\{m\}}\right)$, where $F : \ell_2(-\infty, m-1) \times \ell_2(m+1, +\infty) \to \mathbf{R}$ is some mapping.

Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ be fixed, and let $X_\pm\left(e^{i\omega}\right) = \pm\sigma e^{-im\omega}$, $x_\pm = \mathcal{Z}^{-1}X_\pm$, i.e. $x_\pm(t) = \pm\sigma\mathbb{I}_{\{t=m\}}$. Clearly, $x_\pm \in \mathcal{X}_\sigma$. Moreover, we have that $\widetilde{x}_- = \widetilde{x}_+$ for $\widetilde{x}_\pm = F\left(x|_{t \in \mathbb{Z}\setminus\{m\}}\right)$, for any mapping F such as described above. Hence

$$\max(|\widetilde{x}_-(m) - x_-(m)|, |\widetilde{x}_+(m) - x_+(m)|) \geq \sigma.$$

Then (3.10) follows. This completes the proof of Theorem 3. □

Proof of Theorem 6. It suffices to observe that $\ell_2^- \setminus \mathcal{Q}(\ell_2) \neq \emptyset$, for the operator $\mathcal{Q} : \ell_2 \to \ell_2^-$, since $\mathcal{Q}(\ell_2) = \ell_2^{-,LBL}$. Hence the kernel of the adjoint operator $\mathcal{Q}^* : \ell_2^- \to \ell_2$ contains non-zero elements. □

Proof of Lemma 2. Statement (i) follows from the choice of $P_I x$ as a solution of optimization problem (4.1). To prove statement (ii), it suffices to show that if $\|x\| = \|x - P_I x\|$ then $P_I x = 0$. If $\|x\| = \|x - P_I x\|$ then $\|x - 0_{\ell_2^-}\| = \|x - P_I x\|$. Hence both sequences $0_{\ell_2^-}$ and $\|P_I x\|$ are solutions of problem (4.1). We proved that the solution is unique, hence $\|P_I x\| = 0_{\ell_2^-}$. This completes the proof. □

6 Possible applications and future development

The approach suggested in this paper allows many modifications. We outline below some possible straightforward modifications as well as more challenging problems and possible applications that we leave for the future research.

(i) It would be interesting to investigate sensitivity of the prediction results with respect to the choice of $\{I_k\}$. It would be interesting to find an optimal choice of the set $\{I_k\}$ such as

$$\text{Maximize} \quad \delta_k + \bar{\delta}_k \quad \text{over} \quad I \in \mathcal{J}$$

for $k = 1, 2, ..,$ with some constraints on the choice of I_k, for example, such that $\text{mes}\,(I_k)$ is given.

(ii) It could be interesting to try another basis in $L_2(I_0)$ for expansion in (4.2).

(iii) Optimization problem in (4.1) is based on optimal approximation in $L_2(I)$ for Z-transforms. This approximation in can be replaced by approximation in a weighted L_2-space on I. This leads to modification of the optimization problem; the weight will represent the relative importance of the approximation on different frequencies.

(iv) It is unclear if an analog of property (3.4) can be obtained with $d = 2$ instead of $d = 1, +\infty$.

References

[1] Alem, Y., Khalid, Z., Kennedy, R.A. (2014). Band-Limited Extrapolation on the Sphere for Signal Reconstruction in the Presence of Noise", Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. ICASSP'2014, pp. 4141-4145.

[2] Almira, J.M. and Romero, A.E. (2008). How distant is the ideal filter of being a causal one? *Atlantic Electronic Journal of Mathematics* **3** (1) 46–55.

[3] Borel, E. (1909). Les probabilites denombrables et leurs applications arithmetique. *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo* 27, 247–271.

[4] Bingham, N. H. (2012). Szegö's theorem and its probabilistic descendants. *Probability Surveys* 9, 287-324.

[5] Butzer, P.L. and Stens R.L. (1993). Linear prediction by samples from the past. In: Advanced Topics in Shannon Sampling and Interpolation Theory (R.J. Marks II, ed.), Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993, pp. 157-183.

[6] Church, A. (1940). On the concept of random sequence. *Bull.Amer.Math.Soc.* 46, 254–260.

[7] Cambanis, S., and Soltani, A.R. (1984). Prediction of stable processes: spectral and moving average representations. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **66**, no. 4, 593–612.

[8] Dokuchaev, N. (2010). Predictability on finite horizon for processes with exponential decrease of energy on higher frequencies, *Signal processing* **90** (2) (2010) 696–701.

[9] Dokuchaev, N. (2012a). On predictors for band-limited and high-frequency time series. *Signal Processing* **92**, iss. 10, 2571-2575.

[10] Dokuchaev, N. (2012b). Predictors for discrete time processes with energy decay on higher frequencies. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **60**, No. 11, 6027-6030.

[11] Dokuchaev, N. (2012c). On sub-ideal causal smoothing filters. *Signal Processing* **92**, iss. 1, 219-223.

[12] Dokuchaev, N. (2012d). Causal band-limited approximation and forecasting for discrete time processes. Working paper: http://arxiv.org/abs/1208.3278.

[13] Dokuchaev, N. (2016). Dokuchaev, N. (2016). Near-ideal causal smoothing filters for the real sequences. *Signal Processing* **118**, iss. 1, pp.285-293.

[14] Downey, R. (2004). Some Recent Progress in Algorithmic Randomness. In: *"Mathematical foundations of computer science". Lect. Not .Comp. Sci* 3153, 42–83.

[15] Ferreira P. G. S. G. (1994). Interpolation and the discrete Papoulis-Gerchberg algorithm. IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, **42** (10), 2596–2606.

[16] Ferreira P. J. S. G., Kempf A., and Reis M. J. C. S. (2007). Construction of Aharonov-Berrys superoscillations. *J. Phys. A, Math. Gen.*, vol. 40, pp. 5141–5147.

[17] Kolmogorov, A.N. (1941). Interpolation and extrapolation of stationary stochastic series. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.,* 5:1, 3–14.

[18] Kolmogorov, A.N. (1965). Three approaches to the quantitative definition of information. *Problems of Information and Transmission*, 1:1, 1–7.

[19] Lee, D.G., Ferreira, P.J.S.G. (2014). Direct construction of superoscillations. *IEEE Transactions on Signal processing*, V. 62, No. 12,3125-3134.

[20] Li, M., Vitanyi, P.B.M. (1993). *An introduction to Kolmogorov complexity and its applications*, Springer.

[21] Loveland, D.M. (1966). A new interpretation of von Mises' concept of random sequence. *Z. Math. Logik Grundlagen Math* **12**, 279–294.

[22] von Mises, R. (1919). Grundlagen der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung. *Math. Z.* 5, 52–99.

[23] Schnorr, C.P. (1971). Zufälligkeit und Wahrscheinlichkeit. Lect. Not. Math. 218. Springer-Verlag.

[24] Simon, B. (2011). Szegö's Theorem and its descendants. Spectral Theory for L^2 perturbations of orthogonal polynomials. *M.B. Porter Lectures.* Princeton University Press, Princeton.

[25] Szegö, G. (1920). Beiträge zur Theorie der Toeplitzschen Formen. *Math. Z.* 6, 167–202.

[26] Szegö, G. (1921). Beiträge zur Theorie der Toeplitzschen Formen, II. *Math. Z.* 9, 167-190.

[27] Tzschoppe, R. and Huber, J. B. (2009), Causal discrete-time system approximation of non-bandlimited continuous-time systems by means of discrete prolate spheroidal wave functions. *Eur. Trans. Telecomm.***20**, 604–616.

[28] Verblunsky, S. (1936). On positive harmonic functions (second paper). *Proc. London Math. Soc.* 40, 290–320.

[29] Wiener, N. (1949). *Extrapolation, Interpolation, and Smoothing of Stationary Time Series with Engineering Applications*, Technology Press MIT and Wiley, New York.